Finite Entanglement Entropy of Black Holes

Stefano Giaccari, Leonardo Modesto, Lesław Rachwał, and Yiwei Zhu
Center for Field Theory and Particle Physics and Department of Physics, Fudan University, 200433 Shanghai, China
(Dated: December 22, 2015)

We compute the area term contribution to the black holes' entanglement entropy for a class of local or weakly nonlocal renormalizable gravitational theories coupled to matter. For the case of super-renormalizable theories, we can get a finite conical entropy expressed only in terms of the classical Newton constant either by completing the theory to a finite one in dimensional regularization or by removing the quadratic divergences in the cut-off regularization by the introduction of additional interaction terms. Therefore, our result is independent from the renormalization scheme. We also propose a theory in which the renormalization of the Newton constant is entirely due to the standard model matter, arguing that such a contribution does not give the usual interpretational problems of conical entropy discussed in the literature.

arXiv:1512.06206v1 [hep-th] 19 Dec 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

People have long been involved in understanding a big issue of Einstein gravity, which is actually common to all general relativistic theories of gravity, namely: what is the nature of Bekenstein-Hawking black hole entropy? There are two possible interpretations of the famous entropy formula $S = A/4$. It can have a statistical mechanics origin or, given the black hole state, a quantum entanglement interpretation. If we believe in a statistical origin we should be able to identify the microscopic degrees of freedom compatible with the macroscopic area law. This was achieved in string theory by Strominger and Vafa [1] with a very educational explicit computation. However, it is not entirely clear what the role of the black hole event horizon is in this context. Indeed, what is generically relevant in this approach is the correct identification of the gravitational source, which is assumed to be located at the singularity point because usually the Ricci tensor is zero everywhere else. Therefore, for some reason the matter inside a black hole must undergo a peculiar statistical mutation during the gravitational collapse that is not displayed in any other condition.

On the other hand, in the entanglement interpretation of the black hole entropy the event horizon is just a particular boundary surface splitting the Hilbert space in a tensor product of two Hilbert spaces for the external and internal regions. However, the physical interpretation in this case seems to be quite elusive because the entanglement entropy evaluated with the so called "replica trick" for a generic quantum field theory is typically divergent. It was proposed by Susskind and Uglum [2] that the UV divergences in the area term of the entanglement entropy could be absorbed in the renormalization of the gravitational coupling. This proposal has been discussed in a large amount of papers (see [3] for a recent review), being confirmed in some cases, but not in others. In particular, the case of matter fields with non minimal coupling to gravity has risen some puzzles [4–9] as to what the correct procedure to compute the entanglement entropy is. The problems seem to arise from the wish to retain the interpretation of renormalized entanglement entropy as a state-counting. This statistical interpretation is quite natural in the case of physical regulators, like cut-off by a UV scale e.g., but when gravity is involved generally covariant regulators, such as Pauli-Villars [10–14] and heat kernel regularization, should be preferred and there is no obvious way of carrying out such a counting. This has led to attempts to distinguish statistical and conical definitions of entropy, arguing that the latter is marred by such unphysical features as not being positive definite and being gauge- and regulator-dependent [9]. On the other hand, the idea that it can be the more sensible choice in the presence of gravity has been supported [15] on the basis of the fact that the lack of a statistical interpretation is a common feature with the UV-divergent part in covariant regulators. Moreover, conical entropy is manifestly general covariant and always positive since the leading area term is proportional to the renormalized Planck mass scale. In [15] two limitations to this interpretation were pointed out. The first one is that it can not be applied to a theory involving the quantum fluctuations of the metric itself because we do not have a satisfactory generally covariant regulator for the conical singularity. The second one is related to the fact that, if the entangling surface has non-vanishing extrinsic curvature in the time slice, the standard entropy renormalization procedure fails. In this paper we will only consider entangling surfaces fulfilling the required condition for this renormalization procedure to apply, whereas we will assume a fully general covariant regularization of quantum gravity can be carried out even in the presence of conical singularities. On the other hand both the dependence on the regularization scheme and on an arbitrarily chosen renormalized Planck scale are problems that should automatically be fixed in the framework of a consistent UV completion of gravity. Besides string theory, where several attempts in this direction have been done (see for example [16–19]), it is interesting to check such a picture in a purely quantum field theoretic framework. Actually, even if the power structure of divergences contributing to entanglement entropy changes with the interactions [20], few examples of straightforward computations for interacting theories on a conical manifolds are known (see [21] for instance). The present paper is therefore organized

as follows.

In section II we briefly introduce a class of weakly nonlocal theories of gravity, which are unitary (ghost free) and perturbatively super-renormalizable or finite in the quantum field theory framework [22–33]. The very foundations of the theory are the following: (i) general covariance; (ii) weak nonlocality (or quasi-polynomiality); (iii) unitarity (ghost freedom); (iv) super-renormalizability or finiteness at quantum level. The only difference with Einstein gravity lies in the second requirement, which makes possible to achieve unitarity and super-renormalizability at the same time. At classical level evidences endorse that we are dealing with a "*singularity-free gravitational*" theory [34–38]. However, the Einstein spaces are still exact solutions of the nonlocal theory, including the singular Schwarzschild and Kerr spacetimes [39, 40]. This recent result motivated us even more in writing this paper. However, this analysis only needs the presence of an event horizon.

In section III we discuss in detail how to achieve super-renormalizability and finiteness of the theory in both dimensional and cut-off regularization schemes. The result can be assessed both in pure gravity and in the case of matter and gauge fields coupled to it.

In section IV we take the Callan-Wilczek formula [41] as the operational definition of renormalized entanglement entropy and we assume the validity of the general renormalization procedure described in [15]. If the entangling surface is the event horizon of a black hole, then the area term in the renormalized entanglement entropy is the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and the proportionality factor is given in terms of the renormalized Newton constant. In the case of a non-renormalizable quantum theory of gravity, this is given by the resummation of contributions coming from an infinite number of quantum correction to the Einstein-Hilbert counterterm and it will kept an explicit dependence on the cut-off. We find that for a super-renormalizable theory only one-loop divergences will contribute and the dependence on the cut-off disappears by a one-loop exact (for the minimal super-renormalizable theory) renormalization of a finite number of couplings. Actually, for a finite quantum field theory of gravity no renormalization of the Newton constant is needed. It is believed that in a complete theory of quantum gravity there is a fundamental length that can be physically probed. If we associate the usual UV divergence of the entanglement entropy with the presence of correlated modes with arbitrarily short wavelengths, it is natural to expect a finite entanglement entropy for the theories just discussed. Actually, we explicitly find that the conical entropy of black holes is finite in a consistent theory of gravity coupled to matter as a mere consequence of the super-renormalizability for the fundamental theory reviewed in section II. Therefore, the leading area law classical contribution to the entanglement entropy evaluated with the replica trick (see [3] and references within) will coincide with the analogue entropy in Einstein-Hilbert classical gravity.

In section V we shall compare the renormalized entanglement entropy with the Wald entropy formula for black holes [42, 43] in the gravitational theories under consideration, finding that the area law terms coincide in the two cases. This is expected on general grounds for the definition of the entanglement entropy we have assumed, although it should be noticed that the Wald entropy is defined only on shell. We believe that the identification with the Wald entropy supports the fact that the definition of the entropy here presented is a physically meaningful one. We also discuss possible deviations from the area law in more exotic or conformal invariant theories.

We conclude by summarizing our results that can be generalized to any local or nonlocal gravitational theory. To avoid cumbersome technical details we will often refer to [3, 9] and references within.

II. GENERAL THEORY

The most general D-dimensional theory weakly nonlocal (or quasi-local) and quadratic in the Riemann curvature reads [22–33, 44, 45],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm g} = -2\kappa_D^{-2}\,\sqrt{g}\,[\,\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{R}\,\gamma_0(\Box)\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{Ric}\,\gamma_2(\Box)\mathbf{Ric} + \mathbf{Riem}\,\gamma_4(\Box)\mathbf{Riem} + \mathbf{V}\,]\,. \tag{1}$$

The above expression of the action will be particularly suitable for the Wald entropy evaluation. The theory consists of a kinetic weakly nonlocal operator quadratic in the curvature, three entire functions $\gamma_0(\Box)$, $\gamma_2(\Box)$, $\gamma_4(\Box)$, and a local potential $\mathbf{V}$ made up of the following three sets of operators,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V} = &\sum_{j=3}^{\rm N+2}\sum_{k=3}^{j}\sum_i c_{k,i}^{(j)}\left(\nabla^{2(j-k)}\mathcal{R}^k\right)_i \\ &+\sum_{j=\rm N+3}^{\gamma+\rm N+1}\sum_{k=3}^{j}\sum_i d_{k,i}^{(j)}\left(\nabla^{2(j-k)}\mathcal{R}^k\right)_i \\ &+\sum_{k=3}^{\gamma+\rm N+2}\sum_i s_{k,i}\left(\nabla^{2(\gamma+\rm N+2-k)}\,\mathcal{R}^k\right)_i,\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where operators in the third set are called killers because they are crucial in making the theory finite in any dimension. Λ is an invariant mass scale in our fundamental theory and the coefficients, $c_{k,i}^{(j)}$, $d_{k,i}^{(j)}$, $s_{k,i}$ are running or non running coupling constants, while the tensorial structures have been neglected[1]. Moreover, $\Box = g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu$ is the covariant box operator. The integer N is defined to be the following function of the spacetime dimension D:

[1] *Definitions* — The metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ has signature $(-+\cdots+)$ and the curvature tensors are defined as follows: $R^\mu_{\nu\rho\sigma} = -\partial_\sigma\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho} + \ldots$, $R_{\mu\nu} = R^\rho_{\mu\rho\nu}$, $R = g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$. With symbol $\mathcal{R}$ we generally denote one of the above curvature tensors.

$2\mathrm{N}+4 = D$. The form factors $\gamma_i(\Box)$ must take the following particular form if we require the same spectrum as in Einstein gravity. We write them in terms of exponential of entire functions $H_\ell(z)$ $(\ell = 0, 2)$, namely

$$\gamma_0(\Box) = -\frac{(D-2)(e^{H_0}-1) + D(e^{H_2}-1)}{4(D-1)\Box} + \gamma_4(\Box)\,, \quad (3)$$

$$\gamma_2(\Box) = \frac{e^{H_2}-1}{\Box} - 4\gamma_4(\Box)\,. \quad (4)$$

The form factor $\gamma_4(\Box)$ stays arbitrary, but is constrained by renormalizability to have the same (or lower) asymptotic UV behavior as the other two form factors $\gamma_\ell(\Box)$ $(\ell = 0, 2)$. The minimal choice compatible with unitarity and super-renormalizability corresponds to $\gamma_4(\Box) = 0$.

As a matter of fact we can also add other operators quadratic in the curvature and equivalent to the above operators up to interaction vertices. These operators correspond to a different ordering of derivatives in the form factors in-between the Riemann, Ricci, and scalar curvatures. We name these operators "terminators". However, such nonlocal operators can be crucial in making the theory finite [46] if we do not want to introduce any local (or nonlocal) term with more than two curvatures in the potential $\mathbf{V}$. Here are some examples,

$$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\frac{e^{H_3}-1}{\Box}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\,,\quad R^{\mu}_{\nu\mu\sigma}\frac{e^{H_4}-1}{\Box^2}\nabla_\alpha\nabla_\beta R^{\nu\sigma\alpha\beta}\,,$$
$$R_{\gamma\nu\delta\sigma}\frac{e^{H_5}-1}{\Box^3}\nabla_\alpha\nabla_\beta\nabla^\gamma\nabla^\delta R^{\nu\sigma\alpha\beta}\,,\ldots\,. \quad (5)$$

Finally, the entire functions $V_\ell^{-1}(z) \equiv \exp H_\ell(z)$ $(z \equiv -\Box_\Lambda \equiv -\Box/\Lambda^2)$ $(\ell = 0, 2)$ introduced in (3) and (4) are real and positive on the real axis and without zeros on the whole complex plane $|z| < +\infty$. This requirement implies that there are no other gauge-invariant poles than the transverse massless physical (graviton pole). Moreover, there exists an angle Θ $(0 < \Theta < \pi/2$), such that asymptotically

$$|V_\ell^{-1}(z)| \to |z|^{\gamma+\mathrm{N}+1} \quad \text{for} \quad |z| \to +\infty, \quad \gamma \geqslant \frac{D}{2}\,, \quad (6)$$

for the complex values of z in the conical regions C defined by: $C = \{z\,|\ -\Theta < \arg z < +\Theta\,,\ \pi - \Theta < \arg z < \pi + \Theta\}$. The last condition is necessary to achieve the maximum convergence of the theory in the UV regime avoiding nonlocal counter terms. One example of such function is:

$$V^{-1}(z) = e^{1/2\left[\Gamma\left(0,p(z)^2\right)+\gamma_E+\log\left(p(z)^2\right)\right]}, \quad (7)$$

where $p(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $\gamma + \mathrm{N} + 1$.

A. Propagator and Unitarity

Splitting the spacetime metric into the flat Minkowski background and the fluctuation $h_{\mu\nu}$ defined by $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \kappa_D\, h_{\mu\nu}$, we can expand the action (1) to the second order in $h_{\mu\nu}$. The result of this expansion together with the usual harmonic gauge fixing term reads [47] $\mathcal{L}_{\rm quad} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm GF} = h^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma}\,h^{\rho\sigma}/2$, where the operator $\mathcal{O}$ is made up of two terms, one coming from the quadratization of (1) and the other from the following gauge-fixing term, $\mathcal{L}_{\rm GF} = \xi^{-1}\partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu}\omega(-\Box_\Lambda)\partial_\rho h^{\rho\mu}$, where $\omega(-\Box_\Lambda)$ is a weight functional [48, 49]. The d'Alembertian operator in $\mathcal{L}_{\rm quad}$ and the gauge fixing term are written in terms of flat spacetime metric and derivatives. Inverting the operator $\mathcal{O}$ [47] and making use of the form factors (3) and (4), we find the two-point function in the harmonic gauge $(\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = 0)$,

$$\mathcal{O}^{-1} = \frac{\xi(2P^{(1)} + \bar{P}^{(0)})}{2k^2\,\omega(k^2/\Lambda^2)} + \frac{P^{(2)}}{k^2 e^{H_2(k^2/\Lambda^2)}} - \frac{P^{(0)}}{(D-2)\,k^2 e^{H_0(k^2/\Lambda^2)}}\,. \quad (8)$$

We omitted the tensorial indices for the propagator $\mathcal{O}^{-1}$ and the usual projectors $\{P^{(0)}, P^{(2)}, P^{(1)}, \bar{P}^{(0)}\}$ are defined in [47, 50]. We also have replaced $-\Box \to k^2$ in the quadratized action.

The propagator (8) describes the most general spectrum compatible with unitarity without any other degree of freedom besides the massless spin 2 graviton field. Indeed the optical theorem is trivially satisfied, namely

$$2\,\mathrm{Im}\left\{T(k)^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{O}^{-1}_{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma}T(k)^{\rho\sigma}\right\} = 2\pi\,\mathrm{Res}\left\{T(k)^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{O}^{-1}_{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma}T(k)^{\rho\sigma}\right\}\big|_{k^2=0} > 0. \quad (9)$$

where $T^{\mu\nu}(k)$ is the most general conserved energy-momentum tensor in momentum space.

III. SUPER-RENORMALIZABILITY AND FINITENESS

A. Power counting

We now review the power counting analysis of the quantum divergences. In the high energy regime, the above propagator (8) in momentum space scales schematically as: $\mathcal{O}^{-1}(k) \sim k^{-(2\gamma+D)}$. The vertices can be collected in different sets that may or may not involve the entire functions $\exp H_\ell(z)$. However, to find a bound on the quantum divergences it is sufficient to concentrate on the leading operators in the UV regime. These operators scale as the propagator giving the following upper bounds on the superficial degree of divergence of any graph [25, 51–53],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta^D(K)\,\Lambda^{2\gamma(L-1)}\int(d^Dp)^L\left(\frac{1}{p^{2\gamma+D}}\right)^I\left(p^{2\gamma+D}\right)^V\\
&= \delta^D(K)\,\Lambda^{2\gamma(L-1)}\int(d^Dp)^L\left(\frac{1}{p^{2\gamma+D}}\right)^{L-1}\\
&= \delta^D(K)\,\Lambda^{2\gamma(L-1)}\,\left(\Lambda_{\rm cut-off}\right)^{\omega(G)}\,,\\
&\omega(G) \equiv D - 2\gamma(L-1)\,,
\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where we introduced the following notation: V for the numbers of vertices, I for internal lines, L for the number of loops, K for the sum of external momenta, $\Lambda_{\rm cut-off}$ for the cut-off scale. We also used the topological relation: $I = V + L - 1$. Thus, if $\gamma > D/2$, only 1-loop divergences survive. Therefore, the theory is super-renormalizable [22, 53, 54] and only a finite number of operators of mass dimension up to D has to be included in the action in even dimension.

B. Divergences in regularization schemes

Dimensional regularization (DIMREG) — Let us first consider the divergences of the theory in dimensional regularization [55]. In this scheme if the asymptotic behaviour of the form factors $\exp H_\ell$ is monomial and the integer γ satisfies the constraints of the previous section, then only the beta functions for the operators of dimension D are non zero, namely

$$\beta_{\mathcal{R}^{\frac{D}{2}}} \neq 0,\ \beta_{\mathcal{R}^{\frac{D}{2}-1}} = 0,\ \beta_{\mathcal{R}^{\frac{D}{2}-2}} = 0,\ \dots,\ \beta_{\mathcal{R}^0} = 0\,. \quad (11)$$

For the sake of simplicity we here consider the minimal four-dimensional theory compatible with unitarity, namely

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm g} = -2\kappa_4^{-2}\Big(R - 2\Lambda_{\rm cc} + G_{\mu\nu}\,\frac{e^{H(-\Box_\Lambda)}-1}{\Box}R^{\mu\nu} + s_1\,R^2\,\Box^{\gamma-2}R^2 + s_2\,R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}\,\Box^{\gamma-2}R_{\rho\sigma}R^{\rho\sigma}\Big)\,. \quad (12)$$

Let us assume $s_1 = s_2 \equiv 0$ for the moment. For asymptotically *monomial* form factors, one loop divergent contributions to the beta functions can come from vertices generated only by the form factors while the Einstein-Hilbert $\sqrt{|g|}R$ and cosmological constant $\sqrt{|g|}\Lambda_{cc}$ operators do not produce any divergence (in both dimensional and cut-off regularization scheme). In fact the propagator in the ultraviolet regime falls off much faster than the scaling behavior of the vertices coming from the two or zero derivative operators above. The only non zero beta functions in $D = 4$ are $\beta_{R^2} \neq 0$ and $\beta_{{\rm Ric}^2} \neq 0$, while $\beta_{G_N} = 0$ and $\beta_{\Lambda_{\rm cc}} = 0$. For the aim of this paper it is relevant that there is no renormalization of the Newton constant. For the case of Minkowski signature, one more reason to use DIMREG is that the cut-off regularization scheme is not naively Lorentz invariant (see [14] for a different point of view).

Cut-off regularization scheme — Let us again focus on (12) to avoid cumbersome operators. In the cut-off regularization scheme (see the Appendix for an explicit one-loop computation) we expect, besides logarithmic divergences, extra quartic and quadratic ones in $\Lambda_{\rm cut-off} \equiv k$. Let us consider only the case of quadratic divergences because they appear in the Newton constant renormalization. Using the heat-kernel expansion the divergent contributions to the quantum effective action are:

$$\Gamma^{(1)}_{\rm div} = \int d^4x\sqrt{|g|}\Big[-\frac{\beta^{(2)}_{G_N}}{2}k^2R + \frac{\beta^{(4)}_{\bar\lambda}}{4}k^4 + \beta_{R^2}\log k^2\,R^2 + \beta_{{\rm Ric}^2}\log k^2\,R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}\Big], \quad (13)$$

where the coefficients in front of each term are related to the most divergent part of the beta functions of the corresponding couplings. In particular the beta function for the Newton constant is given by

$$\beta_{G_N} = \beta^{(0)}_{G_N} + \beta^{(2)}_{G_N}k^2\,, \quad (14)$$

which is the general structure of divergences. $\beta^{(0)}_{G_N}$ and $\beta^{(2)}_{G_N}$ are numerical constants depending only on the non-running coupling constants in front of higher derivative terms. So, in particular, in the case of monomial form factors there are no other subleading divergences than the ones already present in (13). Specifically this means that in formula (14) $\beta^{(0)}_{G_N} = 0$.

Therefore, contrary to what happens in DIMREG, in cut-off regularization scheme we have an infinite renormalization of G_N. However, we can add other operators to the action, without changing the perturbative spectrum or affecting unitarity, in such a way that the beta function for G_N will be vanishing. Useful operators giving contribution to β_{G_N} only linear in their front coefficients are:

$$s_a\mathbf{R}^2\Box^{\gamma-1}\mathbf{R},\ s_b\mathbf{Ric}^2\,\Box^{\gamma-1}\mathbf{R},\ s_c\mathbf{Riem}^2\,\Box^{\gamma-1}\mathbf{R},\dots\,. \quad (15)$$

When the background field method is employed all the above operators contribute to the beta function of G_N linearly in s_a, s_b, s_c, etc, namely

$$\beta_{G_N} = k^2\sum_i s_i \times c_i + \dots\,, \quad (16)$$

where $\dots$ means contributions from other local or non-local operators or the potential $\mathbf{V}$. The coefficientts c_i are c-numbers inversely proportional to the coupling constants in front of the highest derivative terms quadratic in curvature. Since the above equation is linear in s_i it can always be solved for one of the coefficients s_i. Therefore, in this modified theory there is no renormalization of the Newton constant. This result is one-loop exact because there are no divergences from two loops upwards. When gravity is coupled to matter we still have super-renormalizability if the matter sector is not self-interacting (see [27]). However, a weakly nonlocal extension of gauge interactions [27], together with the fermionic and scalar sector of the standard model of particle physics, will be sufficient [23, 27] to achieve super-renormalizability also for self-interacting matter.

Notice that in odd dimension there are no one-loop divergences in both dimensional and cut-off regularization schemes, because we can not construct curvature invariant operators with an odd number of derivatives of the metric tensor. Moreover, this result is one-loop exact because we do not have divergences for $L > 1$ (10).

C. Gauge and matter sectors

In the papers [26, 27] weak nonlocality has been extended to all fundamental interactions. This is an inescapable extension beyond the standard model if we want to preserve super-renormalizablity of the gravitational interactions after coupling to matter. Moreover, the weakly nonlocal gauge interactions turn out to be (super-)renormalizable or finite regardless of the spacetime dimension. Following the notation of section II, the action for gauge bosons reads as follows,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm gauge} = -\frac{1}{4g^2}\Big[F_{\mu\nu}e^{H(\mathcal{D}^2_\Lambda)}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{s_g}{\Lambda^4}F^2(\mathcal{D}^2_\Lambda)^2F^2\Big], \quad (17)$$

where H, as a function of the square of the gauge covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}$, can be chosen to be an entire one having the same asymptotic behavior as the analogue functions introduced for the pure gravity sector. For the fermonic and scalar sectors we achieve super-renormalizability with the following action,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm F} = \sum_a^{N_f}\bar\psi_a\, i\not{\mathcal{D}}_a e^{H(\not{\mathcal{D}}^2_{a,\Lambda})}\,\psi_a \quad (18)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm H} = (\mathcal{D}_\mu\Phi)^\dagger e^{H(\mathcal{D}^2_\Lambda)}(\mathcal{D}^\mu\Phi) - \mu^2\Phi^\dagger e^{H(\mathcal{D}^2_\Lambda)}\Phi - \lambda(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2.$$

To achieve full finiteness of all running coupling constants we need few other operators. However, this goes beyond the scope of this paper. For the interested reader we refer to [27, 56, 57].

IV. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY

In this section we consider the entanglement entropy of black hole solutions for the class of theories (1). In particular it has been observed that, for $\gamma_4 = 0$ and a large class of potentials at least quadratic in the Ricci tensor, the Schwarzschild metric is an exact solution of such theories [39]. For such a metric there exists a time-like Killing vector ∂_τ, which is null at the horizon surface Σ. In the vicinity of the bifurcation surface, the spacetime is therefore the product of the surface Σ and a two-dimensional disk, the time coordinate playing the role of the angular coordinate after analytic continuation to Euclidean metric. So the horizon (co-dimension two surface) splits the system into two sub-systems for which we can define a density matrix ρ. The corresponding entanglement entropy can be obtained by applying the so-called replica method, which boils down to considering the n-fold cover E_n of the original (euclidean) spacetime defined at $n = 1$. In this case the time coordinate τ is periodic with period $2\pi n$ and there is a conical singularity on the surface Σ so that in the small vicinity of Σ the total space E_n is a direct product $\Sigma \times \mathcal{C}_n$, where $\mathcal{C}_n$ is a two-dimensional cone with deficit angle $\delta = 2\pi(1 - n)$. The trace $\mathrm{Tr}\rho^n$ computed for the state described by the density matrix ρ has thus a natural interpretation as a partition function for the gravitational field configurations over E_n. This construction can be analytically continued to arbitrary (non-integer): $n \to \alpha$. Therefore, one can define the partition function

$$Z(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}\rho^\alpha, \quad (19)$$

by the path integral over field configurations over E_α. Defining the quantum effective action as

$$W(\alpha) = -\ln Z(\alpha), \quad (20)$$

the entanglement entropy is computed as [41]

$$S = (\alpha\partial_\alpha - 1)W(\alpha)|_{\alpha=1}. \quad (21)$$

A standard way to evaluate the effective action is to express it as

$$W = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\epsilon^2}^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\mathrm{Tr}K\,, \quad (22)$$

where $K = e^{-s\mathcal{D}}$ is a heat kernel and the operator $\mathcal{D}$ is obtained from the second functional variation of the action (1) and will contain both derivatives and curvatures. We want to consider an expansion of $\mathrm{Tr}e^{-s\mathcal{D}}$ in which each term has a definite number of derivatives of the metric,

$$\mathrm{Tr}e^{-s\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}}\sum_{n=0} a_n\mathcal{T}_n(s)\,, \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_n(s)$ are homogeneous functions, examples of which appear in [58]. We can thus obtain an expansion in the number of derivatives for both the finite and divergent parts of the quantum effective action. This decomposition is valid both for regular manifolds and manifolds with a conical singularity. If a conical singularity is present, the coefficients a_n can be decomposed as

$$a_n = a_n^{\rm reg} + a_n^\Sigma = \alpha a_n\,(\alpha = 1) + a_n^\Sigma(\alpha)\,, \quad (24)$$

where $a_n\,(\alpha = 1)$ are the coefficients in the heat kernel expansion on a regular space-time and a_n^Σ are the surface terms given by integrals over the entangling surface Σ. The surface term for $n = 1$ is just the area of the surface Σ and it gives the area term in the entropy computed by formula (21). The coefficient $a_1^\Sigma(\alpha)$ will, therefore, be determined by the full divergence structure of the quantum effective action, where one should include both bulk terms and additional UV-divergent terms localized on the entangling surface [59]. This implies a quite complicated running of the area term with the renormalization scale. Nevertheless, it was suggested that one can skip such a straightforward computation by first considering a family of singularity-free spacetimes and afterwards taking a singular conical limit. This procedure allows to compute the entropy of a black hole by just considering the quantum gravitational effective action W on a regular background (RB) and then deforming the RB to get the effective action $W(\alpha)$ for the α-fold covering E_α. Actually, there is

a standard procedure relating the curvature terms computed on a smooth manifold E to the corresponding ones for E_α [3, 9, 60, 61]. In general the two procedures will not produce the same divergent terms, both because of the possible presence of surface divergences not related to bulk divergences or because of possible non-analytic contributions in α. However, these latter should be excluded [9] on the basis of analytic continuation. In [9] it was also argued that additional divergences can only give contributions at least of order $O((1-\alpha)^2)$, which will therefore drop out of (21). After [60, 61] we will call the entropy computed by the latter method conical entropy and we actually undertake its evaluation in this section.

This implies that the term in the entropy which is proportional to the area of the entangling surface Σ is determined by the coefficient in front of the Ricci scalar in the effective action. More explicitly

$$S = \frac{A\,(\Sigma)}{4G_{\rm ren}}\,, \tag{25}$$

where $G_{\rm ren}$ is the renormalized value of the Newton constant G_N. This is a natural generalization of the Bekenstein-Hawking formula for black hole entropy.

Let us consider the case in which the full theory consisting of matter and gravity is super-renormalizable [23, 25, 26]. All the quadratic operators in the theory are weakly nonlocal (or local for standard killers) higher derivative operators. In short, the quadratic operator in the graviton fluctuation $\mathbf{h}$, including the gauge fixing, reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{h}\,\mathcal{H}_{\rm gr}\,\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}\,\Bigg[&\Box^{\gamma+2} + \left(a + \sum_i s_i^{(1)}\right)\mathcal{R}\nabla^{2\gamma+2} \\ &+ \left(b + \sum_i s_i^{(2)}\right)\mathcal{R}^2\,\nabla^{2\gamma} + \left(c + \sum_i s_i^{(1)}\right)(\nabla\mathcal{R})\,\nabla^{2\gamma+1} \\ &+ \left(d + \sum_i s_i^{(1)}\right)(\nabla^2\mathcal{R})\,\nabla^{2\gamma} + \dots\Bigg]\,\mathbf{h}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where all indices are neglected, while $a, b, c, d, \dots$ are numerical constants resulting from the variation of the form factor in its asymptotic limit (7) and of the gauge fixing operator. Finally, $s_i^{(1)}, s_i^{(2)}$ are the coefficients in front of the killer operators. The reader can refer to the appendix for more details about the counterterms in cut-off regularization scheme [11–13].

Similar operators will result from taking the second variation of the action with respect to the gauge fields and matter sectors.

The quantum action for gravity including the contributions of the gauge and matter fields eventually reads

$$W_{\rm gr} = \frac{1}{2}\det\left(\mathcal{H}_{\rm gr}\right) \propto B_0\,k^4 + B_2\,k^2 + B_4\,\log\left(\frac{k^2}{\mu^2}\right), \tag{27}$$

where k is the UV cut-off. In dimensional regularization there is no contribution to B_0 and B_2, and therefore there is no renormalization of G_N. In cut-off regularization scheme the coefficients B_2 and B_4 will depend linearly on the killers coefficients $s_i^{(1)}, s_i^{(2)}$ respectively. Therefore, we can always get vanishing divergent contributions to the G_N and the coupling constants multiplying $\mathbf{R}^2$ or $\mathbf{Ric}^2$ beta functions.

In order to calculate the associated conical entropy, the effective action should be evaluated on the regularized manifold $E_\alpha \equiv \Sigma\times\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and the conifold singular limit should be taken. Since we do not have any renormalization of the Newton constant we also do not have divergent contributions to the entropy proportional to the area. However, due to the classical Einstein-Hilbert term, we still have the usual finite contribution $A/4$. Moreover, we will have other finite contributions to the entropy due to local and nonlocal quantum corrections to the effective action.

If the theory (eventually including also the gauge fields (17) and matter) is UV finite, we get the remarkable result that the only contribution to the entropy is the finite one coming from the classical Einstein-Hilbert term. It has been noticed that in general the conical entropy (25) is not positive-definite and is gauge and renormalization scheme dependent. For the proposed UV finite theory of gravity we can solve all these drawbacks because we do not have RG running of G_N.

Let us now consider a theory in which gravity and gauge interactions are weakly nonlocal whereas fermionic and scalar sectors are local, just as in the standard model of particle physics. As explained in [3, 9], the renormalization of the Newton constant due to the fermionic and scalar matter is such that the entanglement entropy coincides with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. In our case, due to the absence of divergent contributions to G_N coming from the gauge and gravitational sectors in DIMREG, or in cut-off regularization when suitable killers are included (15), we arrive at the same conclusion for the conical entropy. We want to stress that also in this case the conical entropy, even if UV divergent, is positive-definite and gauge independent as a consequence of the finite contribution from the gravity and gauge sector. If we could switch off the gravitational and gauge interactions (no bare Newton constant is present in the theory) the whole entanglement entropy would be given by the "universal divergent" contribution computed in section 7.1 of [9]. As stated in section eight of [9] this could provide a natural explanation of the statistical origin of the black hole entropy. On the other hand, if G_N is in the bare action, but is not renormalized by gravitons and gauge bosons for the reasons just explained, the above interpretation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is still valid and has a universal character. Indeed, the non renormalization of G_N by gravitons and gauge bosons is one loop exact because for $L > 1$ internal gravitational and gauge boson lines make every loop diagram convergent.

We conclude with the following statement: *only matter participates in giving a "universal" renormalization to both the Einstein-Hilbert term and the conical entropy.*

Let us remark that in a non super-renormalizable theories, and in particular in two derivative theories, G_N (in the cut-off scheme) gets renormalized at any order in the loop expansion and the above interpretation of the black hole entropy is likely lost. Only in super-renormalizable theories the interpretation given in [3, 9] has a universal character independent on the perturbative order.

V. CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM WALD ENTROPY

In this section we want to discuss the relationship between the conical entropy we computed in the previous section and an the Wald entropy. In fact, the formula (21) for entanglement entropy can be rewritten as

$$S = 2\pi \int_\Sigma \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\mu\nu}} \epsilon_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\,, \tag{28}$$

which is exactly the Wald entropy [42, 43, 62]. We notice, however, that Wald's Noether charge method is an on-shell methods so that the metric in the expression for the Wald entropy is supposed to satisfy the field equations. On the contrary, the conical singularity method is an off-shell method valid for any metric that describes a black hole horizon [3].

Using the results in the previous section we can infer that for finite gravitational theories the leading area law term of the Wald entropy does not differ at quantum level from its classical counterpart. However, the full quantum effective action, including the finite quantum contributions, will give corrections to the classical Wald entropy. Since we will use the Wald formula (28) for the quantum effective action, then we will call the related entropy quantum entropy. Therefore, in a quantum theory which has only finite contributions to the effective action, we compute finite contributions to the Wald entropy using formula (28), where we treat the effective action as a classical one

$$S_{\rm Wald}(\Gamma_{\rm eff}^{\text{finite contrib.}}) \equiv S_{\rm Wald}(\text{classical action}). \tag{29}$$

In the case of a simple static, homogeneous and isotropic metric of the type

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + f(r)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2\,, \tag{30}$$

the Wald entropy can be recast as a closed integral over a cross section of the horizon. For the action (1) with $\mathbf{V} = 0$, the following general formula can be found [62]

$$S_{\rm Wald} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\left[1 + \left(2\gamma_0(\Box) + \gamma_2(\Box) + 2\gamma_4(\Box)\right) R\right]. \tag{31}$$

This formula can actually be rewritten as

$$S_{\rm Wald} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\left[1 + \left(2\gamma_0'(\Box) + \gamma_2'(\Box)\right) R\right]\,, \tag{32}$$

where we use the following basis for the operators in the action

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm g} = -2\kappa_D^{-2}\sqrt{g}\,[\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{R}\,\gamma_0'(\Box)\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{Ric}\,\gamma_2'(\Box)\mathbf{Ric} \\ + \mathbf{GB}_{\gamma_4'(\Box)} + \mathbf{V}\,]\,,\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where we introduced he nonlocal generalization of Gauss-Bonnet density, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{GB}_{\gamma_4'(\Box)} = \mathbf{Riem}\gamma_4'(\Box)\mathbf{Riem} - 4\mathbf{Ric}\gamma_4'(\Box)\mathbf{Ric} \\ + \mathbf{R}\gamma_4'(\Box)\mathbf{R},\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

and $\gamma_0' = \gamma_0 - \gamma_4$, $\gamma_2' = \gamma_2 + 4\gamma_4$, $\gamma_4' = \gamma_4$. In this basis the Wald entropy doesn't depend on γ_4', which happens to be the form factor not appearing in the expression for the propagator. We also notice that in any basis the Wald entropy (31) will only depend on one linear combination of the form factors.

For the most general theory compatible with unitarity the Wald entropy reads

$$S_{\rm Wald,nl} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\left[1 + \left(2\gamma_4 - \frac{(D-2)\left(e^{H_0} - e^{H_2}\right)}{2(D-1)\Box}\right) R\right],$$

and in $D = 4$ simplifies to

$$S^{D=4}_{\rm Wald,nl} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\left[1 + \left(2\gamma_4 - \frac{\left(e^{H_0} - e^{H_2}\right)}{3\Box}\right) R\right]. \tag{35}$$

For $\gamma_4 = 0$ the Schwarzschild metric is an exact solution and the correction to the Wald entropy is zero regardless of the explicit choice of H_0 and H_2. Nevertheless, for $H_0 \neq H_2$, if $R \neq 0$ at the event horizon (non Schwarzschild metric) the entropy has a nonlocal correction with respect to the area law.

At quantum level the form factors receive corrections strictly related to the quantum properties of the theory. For a super-renormalizable theory the logarithmic corrections appear in the following Wald quantum entropy,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\rm ent} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\Big\{1 + \Big[2\gamma_0(\Box) + 2\beta_0\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right) + \gamma_2(\Box) \\ + \beta_2\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right) + 2\gamma_4(\Box) + 2\beta_4\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right)\Big]R + \dots\Big\},\end{aligned}$$

where the beta functions are rescaled by the Newton constant. In particular in a local theory,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\rm ent} = \frac{A}{4G_N}\Big\{1 + \Big[2\gamma_0 + \beta_0\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right) + \\ + \gamma_2 + \beta_2\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right) + 2\gamma_4 + \beta_4\log\left(\frac{-\Box}{\mu^2}\right)\Big]R + \dots\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Here we would like to introduce a theory without the Einstein-Hilbert term, but reproducing the same propagator and the Newton law at low energy. The action is "strongly nonlocal", compared to the aforementioned weakly nonlocal theories, meaning that we have infrared

non-locality. The four-dimensional Lagrangian is purely quadratic in the curvature and reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm Q}=-\frac{\sqrt{g}}{\kappa_4^2}\left[-R\frac{e^{H_0(\Box)}}{2\Box}R+R_{\mu\nu}\frac{e^{H_2(\Box)}}{\Box}R^{\mu\nu}\right]. \qquad (37)$$

The form factors can be chosen to have the desired behavior in the UV regime, but a careful analysis of the infrared divergences is required. However, a theory consisting of the (37) gravity action, the weakly nonlocal action for gauge interaction (17) and the local standard model matter sector can still be interpreted as the one-loop correction to the classical Bekenstein-Hawking entropy [3, 9]. Indeed the Wald entropy for the action (37) reads as

$$\frac{A}{8G_N}\frac{e^{H_2(\Box)}-e^{H_0(\Box)}}{\Box}\,R\,, \qquad (38)$$

which is not the area law. Other interesting theories we suggest to apply the formulas in these section are proposed and studied in [63].

We notice that in Weyl gravity the usual black hole backgrounds are still exact solutions, but the Wald entropy (obtained considering only the classical action) is identically zero when evaluated on the Ricci flat Schwarzschild solution. Also in the case of entanglement entropy the term proportional to the area is vanishing at classical level. This is a mere consequence of the absence of mass scales in the theory. If we ignore quantum corrections, from the quantum mechanical point of view the black hole state is not entangled, namely it is a separable state.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we explicitly showed that in a polynomial or quasi-polynomial (ghost free) higher derivative gravitational theory coupled to matter the black hole entanglement entropy due to classical terms and bulk divergences is finite. We emphasize that any super-renormalizable theory can be made finite according to the procedure described in section III. The matter sector is also properly chosen to be quasi-polynomial (ghost free) or weakly nonlocal in order to have a super-renormalizable action for all fundamental interactions. Quasi-polynomiality, or weak non-locality, is crucial to achieve unitarity and super-renormalizability at the same time. In dimensional regularization an appropriate higher derivative kinetic operator is sufficient to make the beta function of the Newton coupling zero. In the cut-off regularization scheme (with or without using heat-kernel technique) the addition of one extra vertex interaction, which is cubic in the curvature, is sufficient to make the beta function for the Einstein-Hilbert operator vanishing. This is an explicit example of a theory in which interactions do matter and make the difference with respect to the results obtained for free theories [3].

Moreover, when weakly nonlocal gravitational and gauge interactions are coupled to the usual local action for standard matter (scalars and fermions), the gravitational constant has a universal renormalization due to the matter content only. This theory is not super-renormalizable anymore, but it is not affected by the interpretational problems of conical entropy that may be found in the literature [9].

Finally, we evaluated the Wald entropy for a wide class of local and nonlocal classical and quantum actions finding agreement with the conical entropy for the terms proportional to the area. We also considered contributions from higher derivative terms, where form factors show up explicitly. This is a further confirmation of the physical relevance of the conical entropy of black holes whose computation has been performed in this paper. It is also conceivable that the surface divergences that we did not take into account may actually give no contribution to the entanglement entropy in the context of a theory of gravity finite in the bulk. On the other hand, if present, such contributions could also be cancelled by switching on appropriate operators localized on the entangling surface. In both cases, the results presented here would then become relevant for the full renormalized entanglement entropy computed through the Callan-Wilczek formula.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ling-Yan Hung and Arpan Bhattacharya for relevant advice and discussions on several important issues in entanglement entropy during the development of this work. We would also like to thank Daniel Litim for suggestions about the importance of cut-off regularization in higher derivative theories.

Appendix: one-loop general divergent integrals in cut-off regularization scheme

In cut-off regularization the main divergent integrals in a D-dimensional spacetime for an asymptotically polynomial higher derivative theory reads [11–13]:

$$\int\frac{d^Dq}{(2\pi)^D}\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{[(q+p_i)^2]^n}\right\}P(q)_{2sn}. \qquad (39)$$

$P_{2sn}(q)$ is a polynomial function of degree $2ns$ in the momentum q (generally it also relies on the external momenta $\bar{p}_a$), $p_i = \sum_{a=1}^{i} \bar{p}_a$. The positive integer n is: $n = \gamma + \mathrm{N} + 2$ for the graviton $h_{\mu\nu}$, while it is respectively $n = \gamma + \mathrm{N} + 1$ and $n = 1$ for the ghosts b_μ and $C, \bar{C}$ (see [26] for more details about the action for ghosts.) Finally, s is the number of external legs at one loop. Once more we would stress that the computation below is one loop exact because as showed there are no divergences from two loop afterwards. We can write, as usual,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{s} \frac{1}{[(q+p_i)^2 + M^2]^n} = \mathrm{c} \int_0^1 \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s} x_i^{n-1} dx_i \right) \delta \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i \right) \frac{1}{[q'^2 + M^2]^{ns}} \,,$$
$$q' = q + \sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i p_i \,, \quad M^2 = - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i p_i \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i^2 x_i \,,$$

where c = constant. In (39), we move outside the convergent integral in x_i and we replace q' with q

$$\int \frac{d^D q}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{P'(q, p_i, x_i)_{2sn}}{(q^2 + M^2)^{ns}} \,. \tag{40}$$

Using Lorentz invariance and neglecting the argument x_i, we replace the polynomial $P'(q, p_i, x_i)_{2ns}$ with a polynomial of degree $n \times s$ in q^2, namely $P''(q^2, p_i)_{ns}$. We have to Integrate (40) up to a cut-off scale Λ_c

$$\int_0^{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}} \frac{d^D q}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{P''(q^2, p_i)_{ns}}{(q^2 + M^2)^{ns}} \,. \tag{41}$$

We can decompose the polynomial $P''(q^2, p_i)_{ns}$ in a product of external and internal momenta only to obtain the divergent contributions,

$$P''(q^2, p_i)_{ns} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{[D/2]} \alpha_\ell(p_i) q^{2ns-2\ell} = q^{2ns} \alpha_0 + q^{2ns-2} \alpha_1(p_i) + q^{2ns-4} \alpha_2(p_i) + \dots \,. \tag{42}$$

By changing variables to $y = |q|^2/M^2$ the integral (41) turns out in :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}^2}{M^2}} dy\, y^{\frac{D-2}{2}} \frac{M^D}{(1+y)^{ns}} \Big[\alpha_0\, y^{ns} + \frac{\alpha_1(p_i)}{M^2}\, y^{ns-1} + \frac{\alpha_2(p_i)}{M^4}\, y^{ns-2} + \frac{\alpha_3(p_i)}{M^6}\, y^{ns-3} + \dots \Big] \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}^2}{M^2}} dy\, y^{\frac{D-2}{2}} \frac{M^D}{(1+y)^{ns}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{[D/2]} \frac{\alpha_\ell(p_i)}{M^{2\ell}} y^{ns-\ell} \\
&= \alpha_0 \left[a_D^{(1)} \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^D + a_{D-2}^{(1)} M^2 \left(\Lambda_\mathrm{c}\right)^{D-2} + \dots + a_1^{(1)} M^D \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2 + a_0^{(1)} \right] \\
&+ \alpha_1(p_i) \left[a_{D-2}^{(2)} \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^{D-2} + a_{D-4}^{(2)} M^4 \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^{D-4} + \dots + a_1^{(2)} M^{D-2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2 + a_0^{(2)} \right] + \dots + \alpha_{[\frac{D}{2}]}(p_i) \left[a_1^{([\frac{D}{2}])} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2 + a_0^{([\frac{D}{2}])} \right] \\
&= \underbrace{\alpha_0\, a_D^{(1)} \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^D}_{\sim k^D \sqrt{|g|}} + \underbrace{\alpha_0\, a_{D-2}^{(1)} M^2 \left(\Lambda_\mathrm{c}\right)^{D-2}}_{\sim k^{D-2} R} + \dots + \underbrace{\alpha_0\, a_1^{(1)} M^D \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2}_{\sim \log k^2 R^{D/2}} + \alpha_0\, a_0^{(1)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\alpha_1(p_i)\, a_{D-2}^{(2)} \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^{D-2}}_{\sim k^{D-2} R} + \underbrace{\alpha_1(p_i)\, a_{D-4}^{(2)} M^2 \Lambda_\mathrm{c}^{D-4}}_{\sim k^{D-4} R^2} + \dots + \underbrace{\alpha_1(p_i)\, a_1^{(2)} M^{D-2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2}_{\sim \log k^2 R^{D/2}} + \alpha_1(p_i)\, a_0^{(2)} \\
&+ \dots + \underbrace{\alpha_{[\frac{D}{2}]}(p_i)\, a_1^{([\frac{D}{2}])} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda_\mathrm{c}}{M}\right)^2}_{\sim \log k^2 R^{D/2}} + \alpha_{[\frac{D}{2}]}(p_i)\, a_0^{([\frac{D}{2}])} \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

The covariant structure is explicitly displayed under braces.

We now rename $\Lambda_\mathrm{c} \equiv k$ and explicitly show the divergent contributions in the effective action for $D = 4$,

$$\Gamma^{(1)}_{k\,\mathrm{div}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{|g|} \left[-\frac{\beta_R}{2} k^2 R + \frac{\beta_{\bar{\lambda}}}{4} k^4 + \beta_{R^2} \log k^2\, R^2 + \beta_{\mathrm{Ric}^2} \log k^2\, R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} \right] . \tag{44}$$

[1] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **379**, 99 (1996) [hep-th/9601029].

[2] L. Susskind and J. Uglum, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 2700 (1994) [hep-th/9401070].

[3] S. N. Solodukhin, Living Rev. Rel. **14**, 8 (2011) [arXiv:1104.3712 [hep-th]].

[4] D. V. Fursaev, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10**, 649 (1995) [hep-th/9408066].

[5] J. G. Demers, R. Lafrance and R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2245 (1995) [gr-qc/9503003].

[6] F. Larsen and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B **458**, 249 (1996) [hep-th/9506066].

[7] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 7046 (1995) [hep-th/9504022].

[8] A. D. Barvinsky and S. N. Solodukhin, Nucl. Phys. B **479**, 305 (1996) [gr-qc/9512047].

[9] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 8, 084028 (2015) [arXiv:1502.03758 [hep-th]].

[10] A. Diaz, W. Troost, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and A. Van Proeyen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4**, 3959 (1989).

[11] D. Anselmi, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4473 (1992).

[12] D. Anselmi, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 680 (1993).

[13] D. Anselmi, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 5751 (1993) [hep-th/9307014].

[14] A. Codello, R. Percacci, L. Rachwal and A. Tonero, arXiv:1505.03119 [hep-th].

[15] J. H. Cooperman and M. A. Luty, JHEP **1412**, 045 (2014) [arXiv:1302.1878 [hep-th]].

[16] A. Dabholkar, Phys. Lett. B **347**, 222 (1995) [hep-th/9409158].

[17] A. Dabholkar, Nucl. Phys. B **439**, 650 (1995) [hep-th/9408098].

[18] A. Dabholkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 091301 (2002) [hep-th/0111004].

[19] S. He, T. Numasawa, T. Takayanagi and K. Watanabe, JHEP **1505** (2015) 106 [arXiv:1412.5606 [hep-th]].

[20] L. Y. Hung, R. C. Myers and M. Smolkin, JHEP **1104**, 025 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5813 [hep-th]].

[21] H. Casini, F. D. Mazzitelli and E. Test, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 10, 104035 (2015) [arXiv:1412.6522 [hep-th]].

[22] N. V. Krasnikov, Theor. Math. Phys. **73**, 1184 (1987) [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **73**, 235 (1987)].

[23] E. T. Tomboulis [hep-th/9702146v1].

[24] J. Khoury, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 123513 (2007) [hep-th/0612052].

[25] L. Modesto, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 044005 (2012) [arXiv:1107.2403 [hep-th]]; L. Modesto, Astron. Rev. 8.2 (2013) 4-33 [arXiv:1202.3151 [hep-th]]; L. Modesto, arXiv:1402.6795 [hep-th]; L. Modesto, arXiv:1202.0008 [hep-th].

[26] L. Modesto and L. Rachwal, Nucl. Phys. B **889**, 228 (2014) [arXiv:1407.8036 [hep-th]].

[27] L. Modesto and L. Rachwal, Nucl. Phys. B **900**, 147 (2015) [arXiv:1503.00261 [hep-th]]. L. Modesto, M. Piva and L. Rachwal, arXiv:1506.06227 [hep-th].

[28] F. Briscese, L. Modesto and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 024029 (2014) [arXiv:1308.1413 [hep-th]].

[29] P. Donà, S. Giaccari, L. Modesto, L. Rachwal and Y. Zhu, JHEP **1508**, 038 (2015) [arXiv:1506.04589 [hep-th]].

[30] G. Calcagni, M. Montobbio and G. Nardelli, Phys. Lett. B **662**, 285 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2237 [hep-th]]; G. Calcagni and G. Nardelli, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 123518 (2010) [arXiv:1004.5144 [hep-th]].

[31] G. Calcagni and L. Modesto, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 12, 124059 (2015) [arXiv:1404.2137 [hep-th]].

[32] L. Modesto [arXiv:1206.2648 [hep-th]].

[33] L. Modesto and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Lett. B **727**, 48 (2013) [arXiv:1307.6968 [hep-th]];

[34] L. Modesto, J. W. Moffat, P. Nicolini, Phys. Lett. B 695, 397-400 (2011) [arXiv:1010.0680 [gr-qc]].

[35] C. Bambi, D. Malafarina and L. Modesto, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 044009 (2013) [arXiv:1305.4790 [gr-qc]].

[36] C. Bambi, D. Malafarina and L. Modesto, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 2767 (2014) [arXiv:1306.1668 [gr-qc]].

[37] G. Calcagni, L. Modesto and P. Nicolini, Eur. Phys. J. C in press [arXiv:1306.5332 [gr-qc]].

[38] A. S. Koshelev, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 155001 (2013) [arXiv:1302.2140 [astro-ph.CO]]; A. S. Koshelev and S. Y. Vernov, Phys. Part. Nucl. **43**, 666 (2012) [arXiv:1202.1289 [hep-th]]. A. S. Koshelev, Rom. J. Phys. **57**, 894 (2012) [arXiv:1112.6410 [hep-th]]. S. Y. Vernov, Phys. Part. Nucl. **43** (2012) 694 [arXiv:1202.1172 [astro-ph.CO]]. A. S. Koshelev and S. Y. Vernov, arXiv:1406.5887 [gr-qc].

[39] Y. D. Li, L. Modesto and L. Rachwal, accepted in JHEP arXiv:1506.08619 [hep-th].

[40] F. Briscese and M. L. Pucheu, arXiv:1511.03578 [gr-qc].

[41] C. G. Callan, Jr. and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **333**, 55 (1994) [hep-th/9401072].

[42] R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3427 (1993) [gr-qc/9307038].

[43] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 846 (1994) [gr-qc/9403028].

[44] S. Alexander, A. Marciano and L. Modesto, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 124030 (2012) [arXiv:1202.1824 [hep-th]].

[45] F. Briscese, A. Marciano, L. Modesto and E. N. Saridakis, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 083507 (2013) [arXiv:1212.3611 [hep-th]].

[46] Y. V. Kuzmin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **50**, 1011 (1989) [Yad. Fiz. **50**, 1630 (1989)].

[47] A. Accioly, A. Azeredo and H. Mukai, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 473 (2002); F. d. O. Salles and I. L. Shapiro, arXiv:1401.4583 [hep-th].

[48] K. S. Stelle, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 953 (1977).

[49] I. L. Buchbinder, Sergei D. Odintsov, I. L. Shapiro, "Effective action in quantum gravity", IOP Publishing Ltd 1992.

[50] P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, Nuclear Physics B 60 478-492 (1973).

[51] M. Asorey, J.L. Lopez, I.L. Shapiro, Intern. Journal of Mod. Phys. A12, 5711-5734 (1997) [hep-th/9610006].

[52] F. d. O. Salles and I. L. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 8, 084054 (2014) [Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 12, 129903 (2014)] [arXiv:1401.4583 [hep-th]].

[53] D. Anselmi, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 045004 (2014) [arXiv:1311.2704 [hep-th]]; D. Anselmi, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 125024 (2014) [arXiv:1405.3110 [hep-th]].

[54] G. V. Efimov, "Nonlocal Interactions" [in Russian], Nauka, Moscow (1977); V. A. Alebastrov and G. V. Efimov, Commun. Math. Phys. **31**, 1 (1973); V. A. Alebastrov and G. V. Efimov, Commun. Math. Phys. **38**, 11 (1974); G. V. Efimov, Theor. Math. Phys. **128**, 1169

(2001) [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **128**, 395 (2001)].
[55] A. O. Barvinsky and Vilkovisky, Phys. Rep. 119, 1 (1985) 1-74.
[56] T. Biswas and N. Okada, arXiv:1407.3331 [hep-ph].
[57] F. Briscese, E. R. B. de Mello, A. Y. Petrov and V. B. Bezerra, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 10, 104026 (2015) [arXiv:1508.02001 [gr-qc]].
[58] D. Nesterov and S. N. Solodukhin, Nucl. Phys. B **842**, 141 (2011) [arXiv:1007.1246 [hep-th]].
[59] D. V. Fursaev and G. Miele, Nucl. Phys. B **484**, 697 (1997) [hep-th/9605153].
[60] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 609 (1995) [hep-th/9407001].
[61] D. V. Fursaev and S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2133 (1995) [hep-th/9501127].
[62] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto, A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 031101 (2012) [arXiv:1110.5249v2]. A. Conroy, A. Mazumdar and A. Teimouri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, no. 20, 201101 (2015) [arXiv:1503.05568 [hep-th]].
[63] A. Golovnev, T. Koivisto and M. Sandstad, arXiv:1509.06552 [gr-qc]. A. Conroy, T. Koivisto, A. Mazumdar and A. Teimouri, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, no. 1, 015024 (2015) [arXiv:1406.4998 [hep-th]].

S. Giaccari: giaccari@fudan.edu.cn;
L. Modesto: lmodesto@fudan.edu.cn;
L. Rachwał: rachwal@fudan.edu.cn;
Yiwei Zhu: 12210190003@fudan.edu.cn.